FINAL DECISION DOCUMENTATION
and
FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
for
Southern Flame Project

Environmental Assessment Number OR-086-04-01

INTRODUCTION

On June 9, 2003, an IDT (interdisciplinary team) was formulated to analyze a proposal to conduct a density management thinning, a snag and coarse wood (CWD) creation project and haul road maintenance on lands managed by the Tillamook Resource Area, Salem District, BLM (Bureau of Land Management). The density management thinning and snag and coarse wood projects are expected to occur on approximately 970 acres of 30 to 55 year old mixed Douglas-fir and western hemlock stands. The treatment units for both the density management and CWD projects are located in Township 3 south, Range 7 west, sections 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 18 and Township 3 south, Range 8 west, Section 1, Willamette Meridian. In response to this action an environmental analysis was conducted and documented in an EA (environmental assessment) number OR-086-04-01, dated February 2, 2004. Appendix 3 contains the public comments received to EA OR-086-04-01 and the BLM response.

A copy of the EA can be obtained from the Tillamook Field Office, 4610 Third Street, Tillamook, Oregon 97141. Office hours are Monday through Friday, 7:30 A.M. to 4:00 P.M., closed on holidays.

The decision to be made by the Tillamook Field Manager is whether or not to prepare an environmental impact statement, and whether to approve the density management thinning, snag and coarse wood creation and haul road maintenance projects as proposed, not at all, or to some other extent.

DECISION

Based on site-specific analysis, the supporting project record, management recommendations contained in the LSRA (*Late-Successional Reserve Assessment for Oregon's Northern Coast Range Adaptive Management Area*), dated January 1998; *Nestucca Watershed Analysis,* dated October 1994; AMA Guide (*Northern Coast Range Adaptive Management Area Guide*), dated January 1997; and *Trask River Watershed Analysis,* dated August 2003, as well as the management direction contained in the RMP (*Salem District Resource Management Plan*), dated May 1995, I have decided to implement the density management thinning, snag and coarse wood creation and haul road maintenance projects described in Alternative 1 in two separate decisions. The decision rendered below will encompass all actions associated with the density management thinning (820 acres), including any road construction and reconstruction necessary

to complete the density management thinning, decommissioning of roads that are used to accomplish the thinning, snag creation within the density management units and the haul road maintenance project along the routes associated with the density management projects. The second decision will be issued at a later date and will encompass only the 150 acre Snag and CWD Creation - Wildlife Enhancement Units Only (EA p. 12).

My decision is to implement Alternative 1 described in the EA and below, herein after referred to as the "Selected Alternative" which consists of:

Density Management Thinning

Approximately 820 acres of 30-55 year-old mixed Douglas-fir and western hemlock stands will be treated. The treatment would include a variably spaced thinning that generally removes the smaller trees from the stands. Clumps of approximately 12-15 trees would be left unthinned at a rate of approximately one clump per five acres. Depending on the stand type, the project will remove between approximately 30-50% of the basal area and 50-70% of the trees. This type of treatment is considered a light to moderate thinning. Upon completion, the canopy closure is expected to average approximately 50% and would vary between 40% and 60%. Open areas around cable landings and larger sized root disease centers would be planted with locally adapted shade-tolerant conifers. Approximately 80% of the area would be harvested using a cable type system with the remaining area harvested with ground-based equipment. The density management would likely be accomplished in two timber sale projects. The first is expected to be offered for sale in 2005 and the second in 2006.

Approximately 35% of the density management would occur within the Riparian Reserve land use allocation. The proposed treatments would be similar in both the Riparian Reserve and in the upland areas, with the exception that there would be "no-harvest" buffers along streams in the Riparian Reserve. "No-harvest" buffers may have yarding corridors cut through them if necessary to yard across, however any trees cut in the "no-harvest" buffers would be left on site to augment CWD in the riparian area.

Design Features:

Design features for the density management thinning have been developed to minimize impacts to water quality, spotted owls, marbled murrelets and their habitat, native vegetation, and soil resources.

1. Seasons of Operations

Harvest Units:

The following table shows the season of operation for each unit and whether harvest operations are subject to daily time restrictions due to proximity to unsurveyed marbled murrelet habitat. The "Dry Season" dates of June 15 – October 15 are estimates based on a typical year and are for analysis purposes only; the actual dates would be based on site specific soil and water conditions

at the time of operation. Special notice should be taken concerning those units that may be operational prior to July 8 and that may consider using Elk Creek road. Elk Creek road is not available for use between April 1 and July 7 to reduce impacts to spotted owls and marbled murrelets.

Table 1.

UNIT	Total Unit Acres[1]	Year Round (ac)*	Extended Season July 8 - Feb.28 (ac)	Dry Season June 15 – October 15 (ac)*	Dry Season July 8- October 15 (ac)	Extended Cable (July 8 –Feb 28) or Dry Season Ground (July 8- Oct. 15) (ac)	Daily Time Restrictions[2] April 1- Sept 15
1-1	162	107		55			No
5-1	122	36		86			No
5-2	15	15					No
7-1	180			180			No
7-2	34	19		15			No
8-1	11	11					No
8-2	35	12		23			No
8-3	7			7			No
8-4	22			22			No
8-5	38		38				Yes
9-1	68				68		Yes
9-2	45				45		Yes
10-1	5		5				Yes
10-2	24					24	Yes
10-3	24		7			17	Yes
18-1	27			27			No
Totals	819	200	50	415	113	41	

***Hauling on Elk Creek road is prohibited between April 1 and July 7 both days inclusive.**

[1] Acreages are estimates based on GIS computations

[2]Operations limited to two hours after sunrise and two hours before sunset between April 1 and Sept. 15 both days inclusive.

Roads:

The major BLM controlled haul roads that would be used are Elk Creek, Bear Creek, Bear Ridge, Clarence Creek, the Nestucca Access road and possibly Bible Creek Access road. The following design features pertain to the use of BLM controlled roads:

- All road construction and reconstruction would be done during the dry season, generally June 15 through October 15 with the exception of Units 8-5, 9-1, 9-2, 10-1, 10-2, and10-3 where construction and reconstruction activities cannot commence before July 8.

- All hauling and road maintenance work done during the "wet season" (generally outside of the period between June 15 and October 15) would be subject to the following stipulations to minimize negative impacts to water quality and fish habitat:

    - The BLM would maintain authority to suspend hauling activities that may adversely affect fish habitat.

- Notification must be made to the BLM before the purchaser would be allowed to haul.
- Hauling and maintenance activities would be suspended when conditions exist that may cause the generation of excessive sediment, such as intense or prolonged rainfall; or when the road surface is deteriorating due to freeze-thaw cycles or from excessive use.
- Weekly inspection of road conditions would occur during haul periods.
- Spot rocking and/or sediment traps would be employed as needed to reduce the potential sediment inputs to area streams and to protect the road surface. Sediment traps would be inspected weekly during the wet season and trapped sediments would be removed once the trap has filled to ¾ capacity.
- To the extent feasible, road maintenance activities that could result in sediment leaving the roadway would be scheduled during periods of dry weather (as early as May 1 through approximately October 15).
- Bear Creek Road would be available for use year round until signs of deterioration are noted (i.e. rutting, fine sediments entering ditch lines, subgrade pumping, existing slump becomes active, etc). Once Bear Creek road has reached a condition during the wet season where maintenance is required for continued use, the road would be closed to further use for the remainder of the wet season. Emergency maintenance measures may be required to secure the road until the following dry season at which time the appropriate maintenance can occur to allow the resumption of hauling.

Elk Creek Road:

The use of Elk Creek Road is limited to July 8 of one calendar year and February 28 of the next, both days inclusive. Between July 8 and September 15 (both days inclusive) operations are limited to the hours between two hours after sunrise and two hours before sunset for the following road segment:

Elk Creek Road - MP 0.0 – MP 4.0

Bear Creek, Bear Ridge and Clarence Creek Roads:

The use of these roads is available year round, however for some portions of these roads, between April 1 and September 15, daily time restrictions would apply for all operations that would produce noise above the ambient level (operations limited to those hours between two hours after sunrise and two hours before sunset). The following list shows the road segments that would be subject to daily time restrictions:

Bear Creek Road- MP 0.0 – MP 4.1
Bear Ridge Road- MP 0.0 – MP 4.0 (All)
Clarence Creek Road- Jct. Bear Ridge road – North 0.5 miles

2. Road Construction, Reconstruction and Decommissioning

All road construction and reconstruction would be of temporary road type and would be decompacted, waterbarred and blocked to all vehicle traffic including OHV's, at the completion of the project. In general, new roads would be located on stable ridges away from riparian areas. The clearing limits for new road construction would be kept as narrow as possible to reasonably provide safe passage. Native vegetation would be planted or seeded on the decompacted road surface during the appropriate season. The subsoiling and decompaction of reconstructed roads would result in a net decrease in road mileage with the Nestucca and Trask watersheds. Less than 10% of the new or reconstructed road may be rocked in order to allow for harvesting operations on some units during the wet season. Typically the rocked portions would be short spurs less than 400 feet (the spurs would only be rocked if the Purchaser chose to conduct operation during the wet season). The rocked road segments would be decompacted with an excavator rather than a subsoiler, as would be used for the natural surface roads. The following table shows the estimated amount of road needed for the project (excluding permanent haul roads), and the net decrease in watershed road density.

Table 2. Approximate lengths of temporary road construction, reconstruction and decommissioning

	New Construction	Reconstruction
Natural Surface	10,300 ft.	8,400 ft.*
Potentially New Rocked Surface	1,200 ft.	400 ft.
Totals	11,500 ft.	8,800 ft.
Approximate total for the project = 20,300 ft. (≈ 4 miles)		
Approximate net decrease in road density after decommissioning = 8,800 ft. (1.7 miles) Decrease in road is result of decommissioning of reconstructed roads.		

*Approximately 45% of the road length to be reconstructed was rocked for operations in the 1950-60's. The rocking is discontinuous and for the most part seriously deteriorated. These roads would be treated as natural surface in that only dry season operations would be permitted across them and they would be subsoiled in the same fashion as other non-rocked natural surface roads.

3. Limit cable yarding corridors to the narrowest necessary to reasonably facilitate yarding (generally 15 feet or less), and space them approximately 150 feet apart or greater if possible. Limit cable landing size to the minimum required for a safe operation.

4. At least one-end suspension of logs would be required regardless of yarding system. Full suspension of logs would be required generally within 25 feet of the edge of stream channels during the dry season and within 50 feet during the wet season.

5. Cable logging systems would be capable of at least 75 feet of lateral yarding.

6. Use designated skid trails to limit areal extent of skid trails and landings to less than 10% of the unit; and keep skid trail cutting limits to the narrowest width and landing size to the smallest necessary to reasonably harvest the unit. Use existing skid trails and landings to the extent possible.

7. Subsoil major skid trails – generally those that have had many passes, are wider, and are compacted to the point that potential root growth as been severely compromised.

8. Retain and protect to the greatest extent possible green trees with characteristics desirable to wildlife (broken or forked tops, hollow cavities, large limbs, etc.). Protect existing CWD, including snags to the extent possible.

9. Retain trees >20 inches diameter breast height (dbh). If trees >20 inches dbh must be cut, retain on site to augment CWD.

10. Upon completion of harvest, create 1.5 snags/acre to mitigate the loss of currently existing snags from the harvest operations, and the loss of future snags that would have developed over the next 30 years through the stem exclusion process. 2/3 of the snags would be created by basal girdling and 1/3 would be created by crown girdling.

11. Retain all non-merchantable western hemlock understory trees, hardwoods >10 inches dbh and, within *Phellinus weirii* infection sites, all hardwoods.

12. Select Douglas-fir trees for retention that show reduced symptoms of infection with Swiss needle cast disease.

13. Limit log lengths to 40 feet plus trim to reduce damage to the residual stand.

14. If necessary, limit cutting and yarding during the bark slip period (generally May 1- July 15) if excessive damage is occurring to the residual stand, particularly to western hemlock.

15. Maintain a "No-Harvest" buffer on streams – 50 feet along non-fish bearing streams and 100 feet along fish bearing streams.

16. Prior to entering BLM lands each work season, equipment would be washed in an approved way in order to minimize the spread of noxious/exotic weeds.

<u>Haul Road Maintenance</u>

On Elk Creek, Bear Creek, and Bear Ridge roads trees would be cut and removed from roadside cut banks and fill slopes. In general these trees are red alder and other hardwoods that are growing out over the road surface and thus exerting leveraged pressure on the cut bank soil. As these trees increase in size, so does the pressure exerted on the cut bank soil eventually resulting in the tree pulling out of the slope and causing soil raveling and/or slumping which in turn results

in higher maintenance costs and possibly some negative impacts to water quality. In addition, those trees on the lower side of the roads that lean over the road would also be cut. The trees on the lower side tend to be the first rank trees that are growing toward the opening over the road. Trees overhanging the roads keep the road from drying out and contribute to rock contamination and result in greater impacts to the road surface and greater maintenance costs. This activity would not occur in areas where the targeted trees are the primary source of shade on watercourses such as the lower Elk Creek area.

Most of these trees are 15-30 years old and range in size from 4 – 12 inches with a few trees of merchantable sawtimber size, perhaps up to 20 inches. Most likely these trees would be removed commercially as miscellaneous forest products. Below are the estimated mileages for each road over which this maintenance activity would occur.

Elk Creek Road:	5.3 miles
Bear Creek Road:	5.0 miles
Bear Ridge Road:	4.1 miles

It should be noted that in any given mile only those trees that meet the general criteria above would be targeted and not all trees along those miles.

This activity would be subject to the daily and seasonal restrictions pertaining to roads as stated above under the Density Management Thinning section.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

The alternatives considered in detail included an "action" alternative and a “no action” alternative. No major issues were identified during scoping, therefore, procedurally, no alternatives other than the “action” and “no action” alternatives were required. Complete descriptions of the "action" and "no action" alternatives are contained in the EA, on pages 7-12.

REASONS FOR THE DECISION

Considering public comment, the content of the EA and supporting project record, the management recommendations contained in the WA, LSRA, and AMA Guide, and the management direction contained in the RMP, as amended, I have decided to implement the selected alternative as described above. My rationale for this decision follows:

1. The selected alternative addresses the purpose and need for action and fulfils the project objectives, as stated on pages 4 and 5 of the EA. This alternative will help accelerate the development of some late-successional forest characteristics, as well as preserving the desirable features currently existing (EA Chapter 3; Appendix 2) The project will also help provide social and economic benefits to local communities, which is also an objective for AMA (Adaptive Management Area) lands (EA Chapter 1). The “no action” alternative was not selected because it does not meet the purpose and need, nor does it fulfill the project objectives. Implementing the “no action” alternative will not help accelerate the development of some late-successional forest characteristics (EA Appendix

2), nor will it contribute economic benefits to local communities.

2. The selected alternative is consistent with applicable land use plans, policies, and programs (EA, p. 5). The selected alternative has design features to minimize negative impacts and benefit the overall condition in the watershed. Much of the newly compacted areas as well as residual compaction from past management actions will be subsoiled upon completion of the project (EA p. 10). The result of subsoiling these areas will be a net decrease of compacted area in the watershed, and movement toward improved hydrologic function (EA p. 22).

3. Implementation of the action will result in a more structurally diverse stand, both vertically and horizontally that may provide for better spotted owl foraging and nesting opportunity, and eventually improved murrelet nesting habitat (EA p. 14-16).

4. One comment letter was received in response to a public notice for comment on the EA and preliminary Finding of No Significant Impact. The Bureau's response to the concerns outlined in this letter is contained in Appendix 3 (see attachment). As suggested in the letter, I considered as a mitigation measure to protect soil and water resources, dropping from treatment approximately 300 acres associated with new road construction. I did not select this option because the benefits of the density management thinning, as outlined above and described in the EA, far outweigh the expected negative impacts (direct, indirect and cumulative) to the soil and water resources, as also described in the EA. (EA Chapter 3).

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Scoping consisted of listing the proposed project in the March and October, 2003 editions of the *Salem District Project Update* which was mailed to over 1,000 addresses; and a letter mailed on July 11, 2003 to 111 potentially affected and/or interested individuals, groups, and agencies. There were no letters or comments received as a result of this scoping effort.

On February 2, 2004, a preliminary decision letter, along with a copy of the EA (Environmental Assessment Number OR-086-04-01) and preliminary Finding of No Significant Impact, was mailed to 6 interested individuals, groups, and agencies that previously expressed interest in the project. Additionally, a legal notice for public comment appeared in the *Headlight Herald* on February 4, 2004, the local newspaper of Tillamook, Oregon. As a result of the notice for public comment, one letter was received and was considered by the Tillamook Field Manager in reaching an informed decision. BLM's response to this letter is contained in Appendix 3.

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Based upon review of the EA and supporting project record, I have determined that this action is not a major federal action and will not significantly affect the quality of the human environment, individually or cumulatively with other actions in the general area. No environmental effects meet the definition of significance in context or intensity as defined in 40 CFR 1508.27. Therefore, an environmental impact statement is not needed. This finding is based on the following discussion:

Context. The selected alternative is a site-specific action directly involving approximately 820 acres of BLM-administered lands which, by themselves, do not have international, national, region-wide, or state-wide importance. The project falls within designated critical habitat for both the northern spotted owl and the marbled murrelet, both of which are listed as federally threatened under the ESA (Endangered Species Act). The project also lies within Essential Fish Habitat for coho and chinook salmon; and is also in the Upper Nestucca Tier 1 Key watershed. The discussion of the significance criteria that follows applies to the intended action and is within the context of local importance. Chapter 3 of the EA details the effects of the selected alternative. None of the effects identified, including direct, indirect and cumulative effects, are considered to be significant and do not exceed the effects described in the Salem District Resource Management Plan Final Environmental Impact Statement, September 1994 (RMP/FEIS).

Intensity. The following discussion is organized around the Ten Significance Criteria described in 40 CFR 1508.27.

1. **Impacts may be both beneficial and adverse.** Due to the selected alternative's design features, the predicted effects, most noteworthy, include: 1/ acceleration of the development of some late-successional forest structural features on approximately 820 acres, including large trees, gaps in the canopy, snags and down wood, various levels of overstory tree densities, and various levels of understory development; 2/ enhancement of the overall level of diversity in the area; 3/ social and economic benefits to the local communities through the supply of timber to local mills; 4/ soil disturbance and compaction would result in an approximate 2% loss in soil productivity on about 50 acres; and an overall reduction of approximately 1.7 miles of road within the watershed; 5/ the activities are expected to maintain the condition of the water quality indicators, with the exception of road density which will be restored toward proper functioning condition; and 6/ no loss in population viability of special status or special attention species (also see significance criteria #9 below).

   None of the environmental effects disclosed above and discussed in detail in Chapter 3 of the EA, nor do the effects exceed those described in the RMP/FEIS.

2. **The degree to which the selected alternative will affect public health or safety.** Public health and safety were not identified as an issue. The selected alternative is

comparable to other density management projects which have occurred within the Salem District with no unusual health or safety concerns.

3. **Unique characteristics of the geographic area such as proximity to historic or cultural resources, park lands, prime farm lands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas.** There are no historic or cultural resources, park lands, prime farm lands, wild and scenic rivers, wetlands or wildernesses located within the project area (EA Appendix 2). Density Management will take place within the northern coast range AMA and LSR land use allocations. The project lies within designated critical habitat for the marbled murrelet and the spotted owl. Although the selected alternative "may affect" designated critical habitat of these species it will not result in adverse modification of critical nesting habitat. (also see significance criteria #9 below). Additionally, the selected alternative "would not adversely affect" Essential Fish Habitat (Project Record, Document #19) so consultation pursuant to the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act is not required.

4. **The degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial.** Public scoping of the EA and preliminary Finding of No Significant Impact included one 30-day public comment period in February 2004. During this scoping period, a total of one comment letter was received (Appendix 3). No evidence was provided that the environmental effects were wrongly predicted. A complete disclosure of the expected effects of the selected alternative is contained in the EA chapter 3, pp 13-38.

5. **The degree to which the possible effects on the human environment are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks.** The selected alternative is not unique or unusual. The BLM has experience implementing similar actions in similar areas and have found the effects to be reasonably predictable. The environmental effects to the human environment are analyzed in the EA, pp 13-38. There are no predicted effects on the human environment which are considered to be highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks.

6. **The degree to which the action may establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represents a decision in principle about a future consideration.** The selected alternative does not set a precedent for future actions that may have significant effects nor does it represent a decision in principle about future consideration. The selected alternative will improve wildlife habitat on BLM lands, and moves the watershed toward a restored hydrologic cycle. Any future projects will be evaluated through the NEPA (National Environmental Policy Act) process and will stand on their own as to environmental effects.

7. **Whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts.** The interdisciplinary team evaluated the selected

alternative in context of past, present and reasonably foreseeable future actions. Significant cumulative effects are not predicted. A complete disclosure of the effects of the selected alternative is contained in the EA, pp 13-38.

8. **The degree to which the action may adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or other objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or may cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources.** The selected alternative will not adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or other objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, nor will the selected alternative cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources (EA, Appendix 2).

9. **The degree to which the action may adversely affect an endangered or threatened species or its habitat that has been determined to be critical under the Endangered Species Act of 1973.** ESA Section 7 consultation with USFWS (United States Fish and Wildlife Service) is in process through the development of the next Programmatic Biological Assessment for Habitat Modification for projects occurring in the Northern Coast Range Province. The Biological Opinion is expected to be rendered by September of 2004 to cover projects implemented in 2005 and 2006. All Terms and Conditions of the Biological Opinion will be incorporated into the selected alternative as appropriate. The selected alternative has been determined to *May Affect, and Likely to Adversely Affect* the northern spotted owl due to the generation of noise above ambient levels within ¼ mile of unsurveyed habitat during the critical nesting period, as well as impacts to dispersal habitat. The project is *May Affect, Likely to Adversely Affect* the marbled murrelet from the generation of noise above ambient levels within ¼ mile of unsurveyed suitable habitat during parts of the critical nesting period. The project *May Affect* designated critical habitat for the marbled murrelet and northern spotted owl but would not result in adverse modification of critical habitat. The selected alternative *May Affect, Not Likely to Adversely Affect* the bald eagle resulting from the small possibility that noise generation would disturb foraging eagles along the major stream corridors causing them to either forage elsewhere or avoid the area during noise generating periods.

A series of legal actions culminated in June 2004 in the invalidation of the ESA listing of Oregon Coast Coho Salmon. As such, ESA consultation requirement and take prohibitions do not currently apply to the Oregon Coast Coho Salmon. However, on June 14, 2004 NOAA Fisheries proposed to list Oregon Coast Coho Salmon as a threatened species (69 FR 33102). Since the selected alternative is not likely to adversely affect the Oregon Coast Coho Salmon, ESA *conferencing* is not required. Should NOAA Fisheries issue a final decision (expected on or about June 14, 2005) that results in the listing of Oregon Coast Coho Salmon, ESA Section 7 consultation will be completed.

10. **Whether the action threatens a violation of Federal, State, or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment.** The selected alternative

10. **Whether the action threatens a violation of Federal, State, or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment.** The selected alternative does not violate any law. The EA and supporting project record includes discussion of the Endangered Species Act, National Historic Preservation Act, Clean Water Act, Clean Air Act, Coastal Zone Management Act, Magnuson-Stevens Fisheries Conservation and Management Act, Executive Order 12898 (Environmental Justice), and Executive Order 13212 (Adverse Energy Impacts). State, Tribal, and local interests were given the opportunity to participate in the environmental analysis process. Additionally, the selected alternative is consistent with management direction in the RMP and the Northwest Forest Plan, as amended. (EA, Chapter 3.7).

PROTEST PROVISIONS

In accordance with Forest Management Regulations at 43 CFR 5003.2, the decision for this density management project will not become effective or be open to formal protest until the Notice of Sale is published "in a newspaper of general circulation in the area where the lands affected by the decision are located." As stated previously, the density management would likely be accomplished in two timber sale projects expected to be offered in 2005 and 2006.

To protest a forest management decision, a person must submit a written protest to the Tillamook Field Manager, 4610 Third Street, Tillamook, OR 97141-0161 by the close of business (4:00 pm) not more than 15 days after the publication of the Notice of Sale. The protest must clearly and concisely state the reasons why the decision is believed to be in error.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE

If no protest is received within 15 days after publication of the Notice of Sale, this decision will become final and may be implemented immediately. If a timely protest is received, this decision will be reconsidered in light of the statements of reasons for the protest and other pertinent information available and a final decision will be issued in accordance with 43 CFR 5003.3.

CONTACT PERSON

For additional information concerning this decision contact Andy Pampush, Tillamook Field Office, 4610 Third Street, Tillamook, Oregon 97141; Telephone (503) 815-1100.

Approved by: _____ 8/9/04

Katrina Symons
Tillamook Field Manager

Date